

**IMAC-QA Subcommittee (QAS)**  
**February 24, 2003**  
**Meeting Minutes**

---

**Attendees:** Jackie Bennett, Racine Co., Co-chair, John Haine, DHFS/DHCF/BIMA, Co-chair, Marilyn Rudd, DHFS/DHCF/BIMA, Chris Elms, Dane Co., Kathy Judd, Dane Co., Joanne Ator, Door Co., Lorie Mueller, LaCrosse Co., Lisa Hanson, DHFS/DHCF/BHCE, Joanne Simpson, DHFS/DHCF/BIMA, Bernadette Connolly, DHFS/DHCF/BIMA, Vicki Jessup, DHFS/DHCF/BIMA, Marilyn Rudd, DHFS/DHCF/BIMA

**Members:** Tom Prete, Dane Co., Pam Lohaus, DHFS/OSF/Southern Region, Jacaie Coutant, Milwaukee Co.

**1. Group Charter and 2003 Activities**

The group had a general discussion of the revised charter and activities for 2003. The charter comes from language in the 2003 IM contract, which states:

**The Department agrees to work with local agencies using the IMAC and its subcommittees to jointly develop strategies to effectively address payment accuracy in the Food Stamp program. One of the subcommittees will function as a technical workgroup focusing on quality assurance strategies that specify actions at both the state and local levels needed to reduce the most costly errors.**

The QAS will develop and recommend strategies for quality assurance compliance in the IM programs. Issues to be addressed include customer service and payment accuracy. Activities for 2003 start with:

- Performance Standards – by July review current contract requirements, review federal FS performance standards for applicability for IM QA purposes. Also review other potential performance standards, incentive funding for benefit recovery or fraud and agency preventable errors. Make recommendations on contract language changes and funding pass through options.
- Coordination of error reduction strategies (including review of the MEQC, FS error reduction issues).

**2. Governors Budget Proposal**

There was a general discussion of the budget proposal to shift a significant portion of Medicaid only cases to state central administration and reduce funding to local agencies. What is the impact on the work of the QAS?

There were several questions about the kinds of cases moving to central administration. In general these would be MA only and primarily family MA only cases. There were some comments about the local agencies being left with the more complicated MA cases and more complicated FS/MA cases. Also, how would MA only cases that wanted FS be handled without additional funding to local agencies? Questions were noted and as more info becomes available the QAS will discuss.

**QAS Decision:** Agreement to continue and focus on activities for 2004 contract.

Joanne Simpson also described the contents of a grant proposal submitted to FNS to obtain funding to increase FS participation. Grants will be awarded from the pool of states that submit from across the nation. Very few proposals will be funded from the total \$5 million available. There are four parts to the USDA Grant. Wisconsin has been offered the option to apply for this grant. The object is to increase Food Stamp participation, integrate with Medicaid, and reduce error rates. The first part of the grant includes a "Customer Service Toolbox" with four web-based functions. First is the screener, with basic eligibility information, including Family Medicaid with options for expansion. Second is the online application. Third will be a change reporting option, to help client's report with ease. And last is the query status, to help clients find out case status information over the web. The second part of the proposal will be to team with the Hunger Task force and other Community action agencies to provide hands on assistance with the new tools. The Grant is due February 26, 2003.

### **3. Performance standards-Food Stamp performance bonus analysis**

An analysis of bonus options from recent Food Stamp legislation (attached) was presented to the group as a starting point for establishing performance standards. The following general issues need clarification:

- Bonus passthrough process – how would any bonus \$ get to local agencies, what criteria would be used, caseload, and impact on a particular bonus award.
- Penalty passthrough process – the same kind of questions arise with penalty passthrough process. Currently Agency Preventable Error (APE) penalties only have a sanction impact on agencies with a QC sample at or above 30/year. Is this fair? If smaller local agencies do not get penalized for APEs should these small agencies share in bonuses?
- Should bonuses be paid or penalties assessed for work items other than ones identified as part of the Food Stamp performance bonuses.

#### **First Performance Measure – Food Stamp Payment Accuracy - \$24 million**

There are two measures, 7 states with the lowest rates will receive bonuses and 3 most improved states will receive bonuses. Discussion items:

- Reports to local agencies need to be consistent and timely
- APE process and refutation process need to be re-examined
- Training needed for corrective actions to local agencies

### **Second Performance Measure – Food Stamp Negative Error Rate - \$6 million**

There are two measures, 4 states with the lowest rates will receive bonuses and 2 most improved states will receive bonuses. Discussion item:

Wisconsin's rate decreased by 5.47% in 2002, from 14.16% to 8.69%. Marcia will report back to the group the reason for drop.

### **Third Performance Measure – Food Stamp Program Participation - \$12 million**

There are two measures, 4 states with the highest participation rates will receive bonuses and 4 most improved states will receive bonuses.

Wisconsin was one of the four most improved in FY 2001 at a 16% rate increase.

Discussion item:

How is the rate calculated? Lisa will check with Alan Shannon at FNS.

### **Fourth Performance Measure – Application Processing Timeliness - \$6 million**

There are one measure, 6 states with the highest processing rates will receive bonuses. This includes both the 30-day processing time as well as 7-day expedited processing where applicable. Priority service is not measured. Expedited issuance is the measure.

QC data will be used to measure performance, starting with the FY 2003 sample.

Discussion item:

Does the EOS have a measure of timely processing now? Marcia will research and report back.

### **Fifth Performance Measure – Benefit Recovery for MA and FS, for IM Contract**

Recommendation that this be added as a performance standard to the IM contract.

Data needed on current recovery effort for both FS and MA. Also, data national data needed for Wisconsin compared to other states. FS summary chart will be included at next meeting. Shows Wisconsin is low.

Discussions of how local agencies handle benefit recovery. Some (Dane Co.) have a specialist. Others (Door Co.) have each ESS do recoveries. Also, there was a discussion of where the passthrough goes in each agency. Discussion item:

Vicki will do a summary of issues related to benefit recovery.

## **4. Error Reduction subcommittee: items done and outstanding work**

Information about Error Reduction work is on the IMAC website. BHCE will forward it through necessary DHFS approval and distribution to local agencies. Other work products such as posters, flyers, change reporting folders and calendars have been put on hold.

Other outstanding projects of the Error Reduction subcommittee are:

- Supervisors forums
- Big Ten conference in Milwaukee
- A find function in CARES like the WPFN screen
- Tim Gard presentation on interviewing skills – Tapes and follow-up response to questions asked during the presentations.
- Ongoing projects, feedback on alerts
- DX state group
- 60-day follow-up letter, a reminder letter to client
- Change reporting requirements

Other information mentioned for group, a management tool from Pat Woldt has been effectively used. Door Co. has been running the Tim Gard videotape in staff meetings as ongoing investigative interviewing training. Also, initiatives and input from staff are very important.

**Next Meeting:            March 24<sup>th</sup> from 8:30 – 12:30 at the Dane County Job Center**  
The committee has set an ongoing meeting schedule of the 4<sup>th</sup> Monday of each month.

Agenda Items for March 24<sup>th</sup> meeting:

1. Review minutes
2. Assignments from group members
3. Start developing performance standards